Charming new physics in rare B-decays and mixing?

Sebastian Jäger and Kirsten Leslie
University of Sussex, Department of Physics and Astronomy, Falmer, Brighton BN1 9QH, UK[*]

Matthew Kirk and Alexander Lenz
IPPP, Department of Physics, Durham University, Durham DH1 3LE, UK[†]

(Dated: January, 2017)

We conduct a systematic study of the impact of new physics in quark-level $b \to c\bar{c}s$ transitions on B-physics, in particular rare B-decays and B-meson lifetime observables. We find viable scenarios where a sizable effect in rare semileptonic B-decays can be generated, compatible with experimental indications and with a possible dependence on the dilepton invariant mass, while being consistent with constraints from radiative B-decay and the measured B_s width difference. We show how, if the effect is generated at the weak scale or beyond, strong renormalisation-group effects can enhance the impact on semileptonic decays while leaving radiative B-decay largely unaffected. A good complementarity of the different B-physics observables implies that precise measurements of lifetime observables at LHCb may be able to confirm, refine, or rule out this scenario.

arXiv:1701.09183v1 [hep-ph] 31 Jan 2017

Rare B-decays are excellent probes of new physics at the electroweak scale and beyond, due to their strong suppression in the Standard Model (SM). Interestingly, experimental data on rare branching ratios [1, 2] and angular distributions for $B \to K^{(*)}\mu^+\mu^-$ decay [2, 3] may hint at a beyond-SM (BSM) contact interaction of the form $(\bar{s}_L\gamma^\mu b_L)(\bar{\mu}\gamma_\mu\mu)$, which would destructively interfere with the corresponding SM (effective) coupling C_9 [4], although the significance of the effect is somewhat uncertain because of form-factor uncertainties as well as uncertain long-distance virtual charm contributions [5]. However, if the BSM interpretation is correct, it requires reducing C_9 by $\mathcal{O}(20\%)$ in magnitude. Such an effect might arise from new particles (see e.g. [6]), which might in turn be part of a more comprehensive new dynamics. Noting that in the SM, about half of C_9 comes from (short-distance) virtual-charm contributions, in this letter we ask whether new physics affecting the quark-level $b \to c\bar{c}s$ transitions could cause the anomalies, affecting rare B-decays through a loop. The bulk of these effects would also be captured through an effective shift $\Delta C_9(q^2)$, with a possible dependence on the dilepton mass q^2. At the same time, such a scenario offers the exciting prospect of confirming the rare B-decay anomalies through correlated effects in hadronic B decays into charm, with "mixing" observables such as the B_s-meson width difference standing out as precisely measured [7] and under reasonable theoretical control. This is in contrast with the Z' and leptoquark models usually considered, where correlated effects are typically restricted to other rare processes and are highly model-dependent. Specific scenarios of hadronic new physics in the B widths have been considered previously [8], while the possibility of virtual charm BSM physics in rare semileptonic decay has been mentioned in [9]. As we will show, viable scenarios exist, which can mimic a shift $\Delta C_9 = -\mathcal{O}(1)$ while being conistent with all other observables. In particular, very strong renormalization-group effects can generate large shifts in the (low-energy) effective C_9 coupling from small $b \to c\bar{c}s$ couplings at a high scale without conflicting with the measured $\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma$ decay rate [10].

CHARMING NEW PHYSICS SCENARIO

We consider a scenario where new physics enters through $b \to c\bar{c}s$ transitions. We refer to this as 'charming BSM' (CBSM) scenario. As long as the mass scale M of new physics satisfies $M \gg m_B$, the modifications to the $b \to c\bar{c}s$ transitions can be accounted for through a local effective Hamiltonian,

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}^{c\bar{c}} = \frac{4G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cs}^* V_{cb} \sum_{i=1}^{10} (C_i^c Q_i^c + C_i^{c\prime} Q_i^{c\prime}). \tag{1}$$

We choose our operator basis and renormalisation scheme to agree with [11] upon the substitution $d \to b$, $\bar{s} \to \bar{c}$, $\bar{u} \to \bar{s}$. The first four local operators Q_i^c read

$$Q_1^c = (\bar{c}_L^i \gamma_\mu b_L^j)(\bar{s}_L^j \gamma^\mu c_L^i), \qquad Q_2^c = (\bar{c}_L^i \gamma_\mu b_L^i)(\bar{s}_L^j \gamma^\mu c_L^j),$$
$$Q_3^c = (\bar{c}_R^i b_L^j)(\bar{s}_L^j c_R^i), \qquad Q_4^c = (\bar{c}_R^i b_L^i)(\bar{s}_L^j c_R^j). \tag{2}$$

The $Q_i^{c\prime}$ are obtained by changing all the quark chiralities. We leave a discussion of such "right-handed current" effects for future work [12] and discard the $Q_i^{c\prime}$ below. We split the Wilson coefficients into SM and BSM parts,

$$C_i^c(\mu) = C_i^{c,\text{SM}}(\mu) + \Delta C_i(\mu), \tag{3}$$

where $C_i^{c,\text{SM}} = 0$ except for $i = 1, 2$ and μ is the renormalisation scale.

RARE B-DECAYS

The leading-order (LO), one-loop CBSM effects in radiative and rare semileptonic decays may be ex-



FIG. 1. Leading Feynman diagrams for CBSM contributions to rare and semileptonic decays. With our choice of Fierz-ordering, only the diagram on the left is relevant.



FIG. 2. Leading Feynman diagrams for CBSM contributions to the width difference $\Delta\Gamma_s$ (left) and the lifetime ratio $\tau(B_s)/\tau(B_d)$ (right).

pressed through "effective" Wilson coefficient contributions $\Delta C_9^{\rm eff}(q^2)$ and $\Delta C_7^{\rm eff}(q^2)$ in an effective local Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}_{\rm eff}^{rsl} = -\frac{4G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{ts}^* V_{tb} \left(C_7^{\rm eff}(q^2) Q_{7\gamma} + C_9^{\rm eff}(q^2) Q_{9V} \right), \quad (4)$$

where q^2 is the dilepton mass and

$$Q_{7\gamma} = \frac{e\, m_b}{16\pi^2} (\bar{s}_L \sigma_{\mu\nu} b_R) F^{\mu\nu}, \quad Q_{9V} = \frac{\alpha}{4\pi} (\bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu b_L)(\bar{\ell}\gamma^\mu \ell).$$

For q^2 small (in particular, well below the charm resonances), $\Delta C_9^{\rm eff}(q^2)$ and $\Delta C_7^{\rm eff}(q^2)$ govern the theoretical predictions for both exclusive ($B \to K^{(*)}\ell^+\ell^-, B_s \to \phi\ell^+\ell^-$, etc) and inclusive $B \to X_s\ell^+\ell^-$ decay, up to $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s)$ QCD corrections and power corrections to the heavy-quark limit that we neglect in our leading-order analysis. Similarly, $\Delta C_7^{\rm eff}(0)$ determines radiative B-decay rates. We will neglect the small CKM combination $V_{us}^* V_{ub}$, implying $V_{cs}^* V_{cb} = -V_{ts}^* V_{tb}$, and focus on real (CP-conserving) values for the C_i^c. From the diagram shown in Figure 1 (left) we then obtain

$$\Delta C_9^{\rm eff}(q^2) = \left(C_{1,2}^c - \frac{C_{3,4}^c}{2} \right) h - \frac{2}{9} C_{3,4}^c \,, \quad (5)$$

$$\Delta C_7^{\rm eff}(q^2) = \frac{m_c}{m_b} \left[\left(4C_{9,10}^c - C_{7,8}^c \right) y + \frac{4C_{5,6}^c - C_{7,8}^c}{6} \right], \quad (6)$$

with $C_{x,y}^c = 3\Delta C_x^c + \Delta C_y^c$ and the loop functions

$$h(q^2, m_c, \mu) = -\frac{4}{9} \left[\ln \frac{m_c^2}{\mu^2} - \frac{2}{3} + (2+z)a(z) - z \right], \quad (7)$$

$$y(q^2, m_c, \mu) = -\frac{1}{3} \left[\ln \frac{m_c^2}{\mu^2} - \frac{3}{2} + 2a(z) \right], \quad (8)$$

where $a(z) = \sqrt{|z-1|} \arctan \frac{1}{\sqrt{z-1}}$ and $z = 4m_c^2/q^2$.

We note that only the four Wilson coefficients $\Delta C_{1\ldots4}$ enter $\Delta C_9^{\rm eff}(q^2)$. Conversely, $\Delta C_7^{\rm eff}(q^2)$ is given in terms of the other six Wilson coefficients $\Delta C_{5\ldots10}$. The appearance of a one-loop, q^2-dependent contribution to $C_7^{\rm eff}$ is a novel feature in the CBSM scenario. Numerically, the loop function $a(z)$ equals one at $q^2 = 0$ and vanishes at $q^2 = (2m_c)^2$. The constant terms and the logarithm accompanying $y(q^2, m_c)$ partially cancel the contribution from $a(z)$ and they introduce a sizable dependence on the renormalisation scale μ and the charm quark mass. Since a shift of $\Delta C_7^{\rm eff}(q^2)$ is strongly constrained by the measured $B \to X_s\gamma$ decay rate, we do not consider the coefficients $\Delta C_{5\ldots10}$ any further and focus on the four coefficients $\Delta C_{1\ldots4}$ in the remainder, which do not contribute to $B \to X_s\gamma$ at 1-loop order. Higher-order contributions can be important if the new physics generates ΔC_i at the weak scale or beyond, as is typically expected. In this case large logarithms $\ln M/m_B$ occur and need to be resummed. We will return to this point below. For our numerical evaluation, we employ the charm pole mass in the h-function. Finally note that, had we chosen different Fierz ordering in defining Q_i^c, Fig. 1 (right), the constant terms in (5) and (6) would be different. This implies a compensating scheme dependence in the value $C_9(M)$ in matching a given UV model to the effective weak hamiltonian.

MIXING AND LIFETIME OBSERVABLES

A distinctive feature of the CBSM scenario is that nonzero ΔC_i affect not only radiative and rare semileptonic decays, but also tree-level hadronic $b \to c\bar{c}s$ transitions. While the theoretical control over exclusive $b \to c\bar{c}s$ modes is very limited at present, the decay width difference $\Delta\Gamma_s$ and the lifetime ratio $\tau(B_s)/\tau(B_d)$ stand out as being calculable in a heavy-quark expansion [13], see Fig. 2. For both observables, the heavy-quark expansion gives rise to an operator product expansion in terms of local $\Delta B = 2$ (for the width difference) or $\Delta B = 0$ (for the lifetime ratio) operators. The formalism is reviewed in elsewhere [14] and applies to both SM and CBSM contributions. For the B_s width difference, we have [15] $\Delta\Gamma_s = 2|\Gamma_{12}^{s,\rm SM} + \Gamma_{12}^{c\bar{c}}| \cos\phi_{12}^s$, where the phase

ϕ_{12}^s is small. Neglecting the strange-quark mass, we find

$$\Gamma_{12}^{cc} = -G_F^2 (V_{cs}^* V_{cb})^2 m_b^2 M_{B_s} f_{B_s}^2 \frac{\sqrt{1-4x_c^2}}{576\pi} \times \Big\{ \Big[16(1-x_c^2)(4C_2^{c,2} + C_4^{c,2}) + 8(1-4x_c^2) \times (12C_1^{c,2} + 8C_1^c C_2^c + 2C_3^c C_4^c + 3C_3^{c,2}) - 192 x_c^2 \times (3C_1^c C_3^c + C_1^c C_4^c + C_2^c C_3^c + C_2^c C_4^c) \Big] B + 2(1+2x_c^2) \times (4C_2^{c,2} - 8C_1^c C_2^c - 12 C_1^{c,2} - 3C_3^{c,2} - 2C_3^c C_4^c + C_4^{c,2}) \tilde{B}'_S \Big\}, \quad (9)$$

with $x_c = m_c/m_b$. B, $\tilde{B}'_S$ are defined through

$$\langle B_s | (\bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu b_L)(\bar{s}_L \gamma^\mu b_L) \bar{B}_s \rangle = \frac{2}{3} M_{B_S}^2 f_{B_s}^2 B, \quad (10)$$

$$\langle B_s | (\bar{s}_L^i b_R^j)(\bar{s}_L^j b_R^i) | \bar{B}_s \rangle = \frac{1}{12} M_{B_s}^2 f_{B_s}^2 \tilde{B}'_S, \quad (11)$$

with values taken from [16]. For our numerical evaluation of Γ_{12}^{cc}, we split the Wilson coefficients according to (3), subtract from the LO expression (9) the pure SM contribution and add the NLO SM expressions from [17]. In general, a modification of Γ_{12}^{cc} also affects the semi-leptonic CP asymmetries. However, since we consider CP-conserving new physics in this paper and since the corresponding experimental uncertainties are still large, the semi-leptonic asymmetries will not lead to an additional constraint.

In a similar manner, for the the lifetime ratio we find

$$\frac{\tau_{B_s}}{\tau_{B_d}} = \left(\frac{\tau_{B_s}}{\tau_{B_d}} \right)_{\rm SM} + \left(\frac{\tau_{B_s}}{\tau_{B_d}} \right)_{\rm NP}, \quad (12)$$

where the SM contribution is taken from [18] and

$$\left(\frac{\tau_{B_s}}{\tau_{B_d}} \right)_{\rm NP} = G_F^2 |V_{cb} V_{cs}|^2 m_b^2 M_{B_s} f_{B_s}^2 \tau_{B_s} \frac{\sqrt{1-4x_c^2}}{144\pi} \times \Big\{ (1-x_c^2) \Big[(4C_{1,2}^{c,2} + C_{3,4}^{c,2}) B_1 + 6(4C_2^{c,2} + C_4^{c,2}) \epsilon_1 \Big] - 12 x_c^2 \Big(C_{1,2}^c C_{3,4}^c B_1 + 6 C_2^c C_4^c \epsilon_1 \Big) - (1+2x_c^2) \times \Big[(4C_{1,2}^{c,2} + C_{3,4}^{c,2}) B_2 + 6(4C_2^{c,2} + C_4^{c,2}) \epsilon_2 \Big] \Big\}, \quad (13)$$

subtracting the SM part and defining B_1, B_2, ϵ_1, ϵ_2 as

$$\langle B_s | (\bar{b}_L \gamma_\mu s_L)(\bar{s}_L \gamma^\mu b_L) | B_s \rangle = \frac{1}{4} f_{B_s}^2 M_{B_s}^2 B_1, \quad (14)$$

$$\langle B_s | (\bar{b}_R s_L)(\bar{s}_L b_R) | B_s \rangle = \frac{1}{4} f_{B_s}^2 M_{B_s}^2 B_2, \quad (15)$$

$$\langle B_s | (\bar{b}_L \gamma_\mu T^A s_L)(\bar{s}_L \gamma^\mu T^A b_L) | B_s \rangle = \frac{1}{4} f_{B_s}^2 M_{B_s}^2 \epsilon_1, \quad (16)$$

$$\langle B_s | (\bar{b}_R T^A s_L)(\bar{s}_L T^A b_R) | B_s \rangle = \frac{1}{4} f_{B_s}^2 M_{B_s}^2 \epsilon_2, \quad (17)$$

with values taken from [19]. We interpret the quark masses as $\overline{\rm MS}$ parameters at $\mu = 4.2$ GeV.



FIG. 3. Mixing observables versus rare decays in the CBSM scenario. Left: $(\Delta C_1, \Delta C_2)$ plane, Right: $(\Delta C_3, \Delta C_4)$ plane. In each case, all Wilson coefficients are renormalized at $\mu = 4.2$ GeV and those not corresponding to either axis set to zero. The measured central value for the width difference is shown as brown (solid) line together with the 1σ allowed region. The lifetime ratio measurement is depicted as green (dashed) line and band. Overlaid are contours of $\Delta C_9^{\rm eff}(5{\rm GeV}^2) = -1, -2$ (black, dashed) and $\Delta C_9^{\rm eff}(2{\rm GeV}^2) = -1, -2$ (red, dotted), as computed from (5). The $\Delta C_9^{\rm eff} = 0$ contour is shown as black solid line.

RARE DECAYS VERSUS LIFETIMES - LOW-SCALE SCENARIO

We are now in a position to confront the CBSM scenario with rare decay and mixing observables, as long as we consider renormalization scales $\mu \sim m_B$. Then the logarithms inside the h-function entering (5) are small and our leading-order calculation should be accurate. Such a scenario is directly applicable if the mass scale M of the physics generating the ΔC_i is not too far above m_B, such that $\ln(M/m_B)$ is small. Fig. 3 (left) shows the experimental 1σ allowed regions for the width difference and lifetime ratio [20] in the $(\Delta C_1, \Delta C_2)$ plane. The central values are attained on the brown (solid) and green (dashed) curves, respectively. The measured lifetime ratio, which differs by about 2.5σ from the SM theoretical prediction, and the width difference measurement cannot be simultaneously accommodated for any values of the Wilson coefficients, although each individually can, and the agreement between the two might be improved with a small negative contribution ΔC_1. Also shown in the plot are contour lines for the contribution to the effective semileptonic coefficient $\Delta C_9^{\rm eff}(q^2)$, both for $q^2 = 2\,{\rm GeV}^2$ and $q^2 = 5\,{\rm GeV}^2$ We see that sizable negative shifts are possible while respecting the measured width difference. For example, a shift $\Delta C_9^{\rm eff} \sim -1$ as data may suggest could be achieved through $\Delta C_1 \sim -0.5$ alone, although this slightly worsens the tension with the measured lifetime ratio. Such a value for ΔC_1 may well be consistent with CP-conserving exclusive $b \to c\bar{c}s$ decay data, where no accurate theoretical predictions exist. On the other hand, $\Delta C_9^{\rm eff}$ only exhibits a mild q^2-dependence. Distinguishing this from possible long-distance contributions would require substantial progress on the theoretical un-

derstanding of the latter.

We can also consider other Wilson coefficients, such as the pair $(\Delta C_3, \Delta C_4)$ (right panel in Fig. 3). A shift $\Delta C_9^{\rm eff} \sim -1$ is equally possible and consistent with the width difference, requiring only $\Delta C_3 \sim 0.5$. It is interesting to note that BSM contributions ΔC_3 or ΔC_4 generically worsen the agreement with the lifetime ratio, giving a positive contribution. This suggests that the combination of mixing measurements might discriminate between different CBSM scenarios. We will return to this point below. We reiterate that, as explained before, $B \to X_s\gamma$ is not affected in either scenario, at leading order.

HIGH-SCALE SCENARIO AND RGE

If the CBSM operators are generated at a high scale then large logarithms $\ln M/m_B$ generally require resummation, which is achieved by evolving the initial (matching) conditions $C_i(\mu_0 \sim M)$ to a scale $\mu \sim M_B$ according to the coupled renormalization-group equations (RGE)

$$\mu \frac{dC_j}{d\mu}(\mu) = \gamma_{ij}(\mu) C_i(\mu), \tag{18}$$

where the sum is over all operators with $\Delta B = -\Delta S = 1$ flavor quantum numbers. (For a review of the formalism see [21].) A set of Wilson coefficients that contains C_7, C_9, and $C^c_{1\ldots4}$ and is closed under renormalization necessarily also contains four QCD-penguin coefficients C_{P_i} multiplying the operators $P_{3\ldots6}$ (we define them as in [22]) and the chromodipole coefficient C_{8g}, resulting in an 11×11 anomalous-dimension matrix γ. It is convenient to define a rescaled version $\tilde{Q}_9(\mu) = (4\pi/\alpha_s(\mu))Q_{9V}(\mu)$; then to leading order $\gamma_{ij}(\mu) = \alpha_s(\mu)/(4\pi)\gamma^{(0)}_{ij}$, with constant $\gamma^{(0)}_{ij}$. As is well known, this matrix is scheme-dependent already at LO [23]. A scheme-independent matrix $\gamma^{\rm eff(0)}$ can be achieved by replacing C_7 and C_8 by the scheme-independent combinations $C_7^{\rm eff} = C_7 + \sum_i y_i C_i$ and $C_8^{\rm eff} = C_8 + \sum_i z_i C_i$ (respectively), where $\langle s\gamma|Q_i|b\rangle = y_i\langle s\gamma|Q_{7\gamma}|b\rangle$, $\langle sg|Q_i|b\rangle = z_i\langle s\gamma|Q_{8g}|b\rangle$, and the sums run over all four-quark operators. We find that y_i and z_i vanish for $Q^c_{1\ldots4}$, leaving only the known coefficients $y_{P_i} = (-1/3, -4/9, -20/3, -80/9)_i$ and $z_{P_i} = (1, -1/6, 20, -10/3)_i$ $(i = 3\ldots6)$ [22]. Many of the elements of $\gamma^{\rm eff(0)}$ are known [11, 23–26], except for $\gamma^{\rm eff(0)}_{Q_i^c Q_{7\gamma}}$, $\gamma^{\rm eff(0)}_{Q_i^c Q_{8g}}$, $\gamma^{\rm eff(0)}_{Q_i^c P_j}$, and $\gamma^{\rm eff(0)}_{Q_i^c \tilde{Q}_9}$, for $i = 3, 4$. The latter can be read off from the logarithmic terms in (5), and the mixing into P_i follows from substituting gauge coupling and colour factors in diagram Figure 1 (left). This gives

$$\gamma^{(0)}_{Q_i^c\tilde{Q}_9} = \left(-\frac{8}{3}, -\frac{8}{9}, \frac{4}{3}, \frac{4}{9}\right)_i, \quad \gamma^{(0)}_{Q_i^c P_4} = \left(0, \frac{4}{3}, 0, -\frac{2}{3}\right)_i,$$

for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, with the mixing into $C_{P_{3,5,6}}$ vanishing. The leading mixing into $C_7^{\rm eff}$ arises at two loops [27] and is the technically most challenging aspect of this work. Our calculation employs the 1PI (off-shell) formalism and the method of [28] for computing UV divergences, which involves an infrared-regulator mass and the appearance of a set of gauge-non-invariant counterterms. The result is

$$\gamma^{\rm eff(0)}_{Q_i^c Q_7} = \left(0, \frac{416}{81}, 0, \frac{224}{81}\right)_i \qquad (i = 1, 2, 3, 4).$$

We have not obtained the 2-loop mixing of $C^c_{3,4}$ into C_{8g} and set these anomalous dimension elements to zero. For the case of $C^c_{1,2}$ where this mixing is known, the impact of neglecting $\gamma^{\rm eff(0)}_{i8}$ on $\Delta C_7^{\rm eff}(\mu)$ is small (the only change in the matrix below being $-0.19 \to -0.18$). We expect a similarly small error in the case of $C^c_{3,4}$. Our stated results for $i = 1, 2$ agree with the results in [22, 25], which constitutes a cross-check of our calculation.

Solving the RGE for $\mu_0 = M_W$, $\mu = 4.2$ GeV, and $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.1181$, results in a CBSM contribution

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Delta C_1(\mu) \\ \Delta C_2(\mu) \\ \Delta C_3(\mu) \\ \Delta C_4(\mu) \\ \Delta C_7^{\rm eff}(\mu) \\ \Delta C_9(\mu) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1.12 & -0.27 & 0 & 0 \\ -0.27 & 1.12 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.92 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.33 & 1.91 \\ 0.02 & -0.19 & -0.01 & -0.13 \\ 8.48 & 1.96 & -4.24 & -1.91 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Delta C_1(\mu_0) \\ \Delta C_2(\mu_0) \\ \Delta C_3(\mu_0) \\ \Delta C_4(\mu_0) \end{pmatrix}.$$

A striking feature are the large coefficients in the ΔC_9 case, which are $\mathcal{O}(1/\alpha_s)$ in the logarithmic counting. The largest coefficients appear for ΔC_1 and ΔC_3, which at the same time practically do not mix into $C_7^{\rm eff}$. This means that small values $\Delta C_1 \sim -0.1$ or $\Delta C_3 \sim 0.2$ can generate $\Delta C_9(\mu) \sim -1$ while having essentially no impact on the $B \to X_s\gamma$ decay rate. Conversely, values for ΔC_2 or ΔC_4 that lead to $\Delta C_9 \sim -1$ lead to large effects in $C_7^{\rm eff}$. Just this is what in fact happens in the SM case, where $C_2^c(\mu_0) = 1$, inducing $C_9^{\rm LO}(\mu) = 1.96$, close to half its total value at NNLO, while the corresponding virtual-charm contribution to $C_7^{\rm eff}$ exceeds the total SM value in magnitude (due to desctructive interference with virtual-top contributions).

The situation in various two-parameter planes is depicted in Figure 4, where the 1σ constraint from $B \to X_s\gamma$ is shown as blue, straight bands. (We implement it by splitting $BR(B \to X_s\gamma)$ into SM and BSM parts and employ the numerical result and theory error from [29] for the former. The experimental result is taken from [20].) The top row corresponds to Fig. 3, but contours of given ΔC_9 lie much closer to the origin. In all panels, they pass through the region allowed by radiative decay, leading to parallelogram-shaped regions covering the full range ($-2 \le \Delta C_9 \le 0$). Clearly, generating $\Delta C_9 \sim -1$ from ΔC_2 alone is ruled out at high significance (somewhat less so for ΔC_4). It is, however, possible to generate it jointly through ΔC_2 and ΔC_4 (bottom-right plot); this entails a cancellation between contributions to $C_7^{\rm eff}$.



FIG. 4. Mixing observables versus rare decays, for ΔC_i renormalized at $\mu_0 = M_W$. Color coding as in Figure 3, $B \to X_s\gamma$ constraint shown in addition (straight blue bands).

The width difference (brown solid lines and bands) constrains all scenarios. In all but the $(\Delta C_2, \Delta C_4)$ case it is consistent with both radiative decay and $\Delta C_9 = -1$, and in the $(\Delta C_1, \Delta C_2)$ and $(\Delta C_2, \Delta C_3)$ cases it narrows down the allowed regions further.

The measured lifetime ratio, which is about 2.5σ from the SM prediction, can be accommodated in the $(\Delta C_1, \Delta C_2)$, $(\Delta C_2, \Delta C_3)$, and $(\Delta C_2, \Delta C_4)$ scenarios, though it is never consistent with more than one of the other three observables (including ΔC_9). The $(\Delta C_3, \Delta C_4)$ scenario can reproduce the lifetime ratio only for values outside the plot region (and inconsistent with radiative decay), while the $(\Delta C_1, \Delta C_3)$ and $(\Delta C_1, \Delta C_4)$ scenarios cannot accommodate values below about 0.999 at all. We caution that the lifetime ratio constraint depends rather strongly on the charm quark mass scheme (not included in the error band). This would be resolved by higher-order calculations. The lifetime ratio could be affected by BSM contributions in τ_{B_d} that do not affect the other observables, and $C_7^{\rm eff}$ could be affected by additional short-distance contributions, such



FIG. 5. Future prospects for mixing observables. Dashed: contours of constant width difference, dotted: contours of constant lifetime ratio. See text for discussion.

we cannot necessarily expect a consistent region in any of our two-parameter planes. One could also consider three or all four ΔC_i simultaneously.

PROSPECTS AND SUMMARY

The preceding discussion suggests that better knowledge of width difference and lifetime ratio, as well as $BR(B \to X_s\gamma)$, may have the potential to discriminate beween different CBSM scenarios, or rule them out altogether, subject to the stated caveats. This is illustrated in Fig. 5, showing contour values for both mixing observables. In each panel, the solid (brown and green) contours correspond to the SM central values of the width difference and lifetime ratio (respectively). The spacing of the accompanying contours is such that the area between any two neighbouring contours corresponds to a prospective 1σ-region, assuming a combined (theoretical and experimental) error on the lifetime ratio of 0.001 and a combined error on $\Delta\Gamma_s$ of 5%. The assumed future errors are ambitious but seem feasible with expected experimental and theoretical progress. Overlaid is the (current) $B \to X_s\gamma$ constraint. The figure indicates that discrimination between the two scenarios may indeed be possible, as well as independent evidence for a (CBSM-induced) effect in ΔC_9, although this somewhat depends on the eventual values of the mixing observables. Further progress on $B \to X_s\gamma$ in the Belle II era would provide complementary information.

In summary, we have given a comprehensive analysis of BSM effects in partonic $b \to c\bar{c}s$ transitions (CBSM scenario) in the CP conserving case, focusing on those observables that can be computed in a heavy-quark expansion, considering both low and high new physics mass scales. In both cases, an effect in rare semileptonic B-decays of the type and size hinted at by current LHCb and B-factory data can be generated, while satisfying the constraint from inclusive $B \to X_s\gamma$. The effect can originate from different combinations of $b \to c\bar{c}s$ operators. The required Wilson coefficients are so small that constraints from B-decays into charm are

not effective, particularly in the high-scale case, where large renormalization-group enhancements are present. A more precise measurement of mixing observables, at a level achievable at LHCb, may be able to confirm (or rule out) the CBSM scenario, and to discriminate between different BSM couplings. Finally, let us stress that all CBSM effects are lepton-flavour-universal. In particular, if the CBSM scenario indeed accounts for the bulk of the rare B decay anomalies, the true value of the lepton flavour universality parameter R_K should be much closer to one than current experimental central values [30] suggest. With the stated caveats, our conclusions are rather model-independent. It would be interesting to construct concrete realisations of the CBSM scenario.

We would like to thank C. Bobeth, P. Gambino, M. Gorbahn, and in particular M. Misiak for discussions. This work was supported by an IPPP Associateship. SJ and KL acknowledge support by STFC consolidated grant ST/L000504/1, an STFC studentship, and a Weizmann Institute "Weizmann-UK Making Connections" grant. AL and MK are supported by the STFC IPPP grant.

* S.Jaeger@sussex.ac.uk
† m.j.kirk@durham.ac.uk

[1] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), JHEP **06**, 133 (2014), arXiv:1403.8044 [hep-ex].
[2] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), JHEP **09**, 179 (2015), arXiv:1506.08777 [hep-ex]; V. Khachatryan *et al.* (CMS), Phys. Lett. **B753**, 424 (2016), arXiv:1507.08126 [hep-ex].
[3] J. P. Lees *et al.* (BaBar), Phys. Rev. **D93**, 052015 (2016), arXiv:1508.07960 [hep-ex]; J. T. Wei *et al.* (Belle), Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 171801 (2009), arXiv:0904.0770 [hep-ex]; T. Aaltonen *et al.* (CDF), Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 081807 (2012), arXiv:1108.0695 [hep-ex]; R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), JHEP **02**, 104 (2016), arXiv:1512.04442 [hep-ex]; A. Abdesselam *et al.* (Belle), in *Proceedings, LHCSki 2016 - A First Discussion of 13 TeV Results: Obergurgl, Austria, April 10-15, 2016* (2016) arXiv:1604.04042 [hep-ex]; S. Wehle *et al.* (Belle), (2016), arXiv:1612.05014 [hep-ex].
[4] F. Beaujean, C. Bobeth, and D. van Dyk, Eur. Phys. J. **C74**, 2897 (2014), [Erratum: Eur. Phys. J.C74,3179(2014)], arXiv:1310.2478 [hep-ph]; W. Altmannshofer and D. M. Straub, Eur. Phys. J. **C75**, 382 (2015), arXiv:1411.3161 [hep-ph]; S. Descotes-Genon, L. Hofer, J. Matias, and J. Virto, JHEP **06**, 092 (2016), arXiv:1510.04239 [hep-ph]; T. Hurth, F. Mahmoudi, and S. Neshatpour, Nucl. Phys. **B909**, 737 (2016), arXiv:1603.00865 [hep-ph].
[5] S. Jäger and J. Martin Camalich, JHEP **05**, 043 (2013), arXiv:1212.2263 [hep-ph]; Phys. Rev. **D93**, 014028 (2016), arXiv:1412.3183 [hep-ph]; M. Ciuchini, M. Fedele, E. Franco, S. Mishima, A. Paul, L. Silvestrini, and M. Valli, JHEP **06**, 116 (2016), arXiv:1512.07157 [hep-ph].
[6] A. J. Buras and J. Girrbach, JHEP **12**, 009 (2013), arXiv:1309.2466 [hep-ph]; R. Gauld, F. Goertz, and U. Haisch, JHEP **01**, 069 (2014), arXiv:1310.1082 [hep-ph]; A. J. Buras, F. De Fazio, and J. Girrbach, JHEP **02**, 112 (2014), arXiv:1311.6729 [hep-ph]; W. Altmannshofer, S. Gori, M. Pospelov, and I. Yavin, Phys. Rev. **D89**, 095033 (2014), arXiv:1403.1269 [hep-ph]; G. Hiller and M. Schmaltz, Phys. Rev. **D90**, 054014 (2014), arXiv:1408.1627 [hep-ph]; B. Gripaios, M. Nardecchia, and S. A. Renner, JHEP **05**, 006 (2015), arXiv:1412.1791 [hep-ph]; A. Crivellin, G. D'Ambrosio, and J. Heeck, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 151801 (2015), arXiv:1501.00993 [hep-ph]; I. de Medeiros Varzielas and G. Hiller, JHEP **06**, 072 (2015), arXiv:1503.01084 [hep-ph]; A. Crivellin, G. D'Ambrosio, and J. Heeck, Phys. Rev. **D91**, 075006 (2015), arXiv:1503.03477 [hep-ph]; D. Becirevic, S. Fajfer, and N. Kosnik, Phys. Rev. **D92**, 014016 (2015), arXiv:1503.09024 [hep-ph]; A. Celis, J. Fuentes-Martin, M. Jung, and H. Serodio, Phys. Rev. **D92**, 015007 (2015), arXiv:1505.03079 [hep-ph]; R. Alonso, B. Grinstein, and J. Martin Camalich, JHEP **10**, 184 (2015), arXiv:1505.05164 [hep-ph]; G. Bélanger, C. Delaunay, and S. Westhoff, Phys. Rev. **D92**, 055021 (2015), arXiv:1507.06660 [hep-ph]; A. Falkowski, M. Nardecchia, and R. Ziegler, JHEP **11**, 173 (2015), arXiv:1509.01249 [hep-ph]; B. Gripaios, M. Nardecchia, and S. A. Renner, JHEP **06**, 083 (2016), arXiv:1509.05020 [hep-ph]; M. Bauer and M. Neubert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 141802 (2016), arXiv:1511.01900 [hep-ph]; S. Fajfer and N. Kosnik, Phys. Lett. **B755**, 270 (2016), arXiv:1511.06024 [hep-ph]; S. M. Boucenna, A. Celis, J. Fuentes-Martin, A. Vicente, and J. Virto, JHEP **12**, 059 (2016), arXiv:1608.01349 [hep-ph]; P. Arnan, L. Hofer, F. Mescia, and A. Crivellin, (2016), arXiv:1608.07832 [hep-ph]; D. Becirevic, S. Fajfer, N. Kosnik, and O. Sumensari, Phys. Rev. **D94**, 115021 (2016), arXiv:1608.08501 [hep-ph]; A. Crivellin, J. Fuentes-Martin, A. Greljo, and G. Isidori, Phys. Lett. **B766**, 77 (2017), arXiv:1611.02703 [hep-ph].
[7] G. Aad *et al.* (ATLAS), JHEP **08**, 147 (2016), arXiv:1601.03297 [hep-ex]; V. Khachatryan *et al.* (CMS), Phys. Lett. **B757**, 97 (2016), arXiv:1507.07527 [hep-ex]; R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 041801 (2015), arXiv:1411.3104 [hep-ex]; JHEP **04**, 114 (2014), arXiv:1402.2554 [hep-ex].
[8] C. Bobeth, U. Haisch, A. Lenz, B. Pecjak, and G. Tetlalmatzi-Xolocotzi, JHEP **06**, 040 (2014), arXiv:1404.2531 [hep-ph]; C. Bobeth, M. Gorbahn, and S. Vickers, Eur. Phys. J. **C75**, 340 (2015), arXiv:1409.3252 [hep-ph]; J. Brod, A. Lenz, G. Tetlalmatzi-Xolocotzi, and M. Wiebusch, Phys. Rev. **D92**, 033002 (2015), arXiv:1412.1446 [hep-ph]; C. W. Bauer and N. D. Dunn, Phys. Lett. **B696**, 362 (2011), arXiv:1006.1629 [hep-ph].
[9] J. Lyon and R. Zwicky, (2014), arXiv:1406.0566 [hep-ph].
[10] S. Chen *et al.* (CLEO), Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 251807 (2001), arXiv:hep-ex/0108032 [hep-ex]; K. Abe *et al.* (Belle), Phys. Lett. **B511**, 151 (2001), arXiv:hep-ex/0103042 [hep-ex]; B. Aubert *et al.* (BaBar), Phys. Rev. **D77**, 051103 (2008), arXiv:0711.4889 [hep-ex]; A. Limosani *et al.* (Belle), Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 241801 (2009), arXiv:0907.1384 [hep-ex]; J. P. Lees *et al.* (BaBar), Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 191801 (2012), arXiv:1207.2690 [hep-ex]; Phys. Rev. **D86**, 112008 (2012), arXiv:1207.5772 [hep-ex]; Phys. Rev. **D86**,

052012 (2012), arXiv:1207.2520 [hep-ex]; T. Saito *et al.* (Belle), Phys. Rev. **D91**, 052004 (2015), arXiv:1411.7198 [hep-ex].
[11] A. J. Buras, M. Misiak, and J. Urban, Nucl. Phys. **B586**, 397 (2000), arXiv:hep-ph/0005183 [hep-ph].
[12] S. Jäger, M. Kirk, A. Lenz, and K. Leslie, *in preparation*.
[13] V. A. Khoze and M. A. Shifman, Sov. Phys. Usp. **26**, 387 (1983); M. A. Shifman and M. B. Voloshin, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **41**, 120 (1985), [Yad. Fiz.41,187(1985)]; I. I. Y. Bigi, N. G. Uraltsev, and A. I. Vainshtein, Phys. Lett. **B293**, 430 (1992), [Erratum: Phys. Lett.B297,477(1992)], arXiv:hep-ph/9207214 [hep-ph].
[14] A. Lenz, (2014), arXiv:1405.3601 [hep-ph].
[15] M. Artuso, G. Borissov, and A. Lenz, Rev. Mod. Phys. **88**, 045002 (2016), arXiv:1511.09466 [hep-ph].
[16] S. Aoki *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. **C74**, 2890 (2014), arXiv:1310.8555 [hep-lat].
[17] M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, and I. Dunietz, Phys. Rev. **D54**, 4419 (1996), [Erratum: Phys. Rev.D83,119902(2011)], arXiv:hep-ph/9605259 [hep-ph]; A. S. Dighe, T. Hurth, C. S. Kim, and T. Yoshikawa, Nucl. Phys. **B624**, 377 (2002), arXiv:hep-ph/0109088 [hep-ph]; M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, C. Greub, A. Lenz, and U. Nierste, Phys. Lett. **B459**, 631 (1999), arXiv:hep-ph/9808385 [hep-ph]; M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, A. Lenz, and U. Nierste, Phys. Lett. **B576**, 173 (2003), arXiv:hep-ph/0307344 [hep-ph]; M. Ciuchini, E. Franco, V. Lubicz, F. Mescia, and C. Tarantino, JHEP **08**, 031 (2003), arXiv:hep-ph/0308029 [hep-ph]; A. Lenz and U. Nierste, JHEP **06**, 072 (2007), arXiv:hep-ph/0612167 [hep-ph].
[18] E. Franco, V. Lubicz, F. Mescia, and C. Tarantino, Nucl. Phys. **B633**, 212 (2002), arXiv:hep-ph/0203089 [hep-ph].
[19] D. Becirevic, *Proceedings, 2001 Europhysics Conference on High Energy Physics (EPS-HEP 2001): Budapest, Hungary, July 12-18, 2001*, PoS **HEP2001**, 098 (2001), arXiv:hep-ph/0110124 [hep-ph].
[20] Y. Amhis *et al.*, (2016), arXiv:1612.07233 [hep-ex].
[21] G. Buchalla, A. J. Buras, and M. E. Lautenbacher, Rev. Mod. Phys. **68**, 1125 (1996), arXiv:hep-ph/9512380 [hep-ph].
[22] K. G. Chetyrkin, M. Misiak, and M. Munz, Phys. Lett. **B400**, 206 (1997), [Erratum: Phys. Lett.B425,414(1998)], arXiv:hep-ph/9612313 [hep-ph].
[23] M. Ciuchini, E. Franco, G. Martinelli, L. Reina, and L. Silvestrini, Phys. Lett. **B316**, 127 (1993), arXiv:hep-ph/9307364 [hep-ph]; Phys. Lett. **B334**, 137 (1994), arXiv:hep-ph/9406239 [hep-ph]; M. Ciuchini, E. Franco, L. Reina, and L. Silvestrini, Nucl. Phys. **B421**, 41 (1994), arXiv:hep-ph/9311357 [hep-ph].
[24] M. K. Gaillard and B. W. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **33**, 108 (1974); G. Altarelli and L. Maiani, Phys. Lett. **B52**, 351 (1974); F. J. Gilman and M. B. Wise, Phys. Rev. **D20**, 2392 (1979); M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein, and V. I. Zakharov, Sov. Phys. JETP **45**, 670 (1977), [Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.72,1275(1977)].
[25] F. J. Gilman and M. B. Wise, Phys. Rev. **D21**, 3150 (1980).
[26] B. Guberina and R. D. Peccei, Nucl. Phys. **B163**, 289 (1980).
[27] S. Bertolini, F. Borzumati, and A. Masiero, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 180 (1987); B. Grinstein, R. P. Springer, and M. B. Wise, Phys. Lett. **B202**, 138 (1988); Nucl. Phys. **B339**, 269 (1990); M. Misiak, Phys. Lett. **B269**, 161 (1991).
[28] K. G. Chetyrkin, M. Misiak, and M. Munz, Nucl. Phys. **B518**, 473 (1998), arXiv:hep-ph/9711266 [hep-ph].
[29] M. Misiak *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 221801 (2015), arXiv:1503.01789 [hep-ph].
[30] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 151601 (2014), arXiv:1406.6482 [hep-ex].